



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/681,760 | 05/31/2001 | Sean M. McCullough | VIGN1260-1 | 6413 |
| 25094 | 7590 01/27/2004 | EXAMINER | | |
| GRAY, CARY, WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP | | | PATEL, ASHOKKUMAR B | |
| SUITE 400 | I MOPAC EXPRESSWAY | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| AUSTIN, TX 78746-6875 | | | 2154 | 3 |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 01/27/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | 09/681,760 | MCCULLOUGH, SEAN M. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Ashok B. Patel | 2154 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply | appears on the cover sheet w | ith the correspondence address | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a less of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions are period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state to reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | N. R. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a seriesty within the statutory minimum of thir idod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become A | reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133). | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | ·• | | | | | |
| 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Th | nis action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | are closion requirement. | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Exami 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct that any objected to by the | ccepted or b) objected to he drawing(s) be held in abeyar ection is required if the drawing | ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume * See the attached detailed Office action for a li 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome since a specific reference was included in the safety and The translation of the foreign language priority. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes reference was included in the first sentence of | ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). ist of the certified copies not estic priority under 35 U.S.C. first sentence of the specifical provisional application has be estic priority under 35 U.S.C. | pplication No received in this National Stage received. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) ation or in an Application Data Sheet. een received. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | 5) Notice of In | ummary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) formal Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |

Art Unit: 2154

DETAILED ACTION

1. Application Number 09/681, 760 was filed on 05/31/2001 with priority date of 06/02/2000. Claims 1-18 are subject to examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specif ation shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "first profile" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-3, 8-12,17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. (hereinafter Davis)(US 5,796, 952).

Referring to claims 1, 2 and 3,

Art Unit: 2154

The reference Davis teaches a tracking program for creating a database (tables) for user profiles. (col.4, lines 19-23). It also teaches that the database can contain client lds (first identifier for the user), Network lds (network addresses accessed by the user), and the time spent by the users interfacing with and using particular resources and details of choices created by the users within a particular resource (temporal information related to the user identifier and the network addresses). (col.4, lines 24-33). It also teaches that the tracking program can be implemented for gathering the information to be included in the database about different websites (data including network addresses and corresponding category information) (col. 13, lines 5-18). It also teaches that this information can be included in two distinct databases, one database (second data) which is indexable by resource identity including URL of the web document and resources (data includina network addresses and corresponding information)(col.15, lines 59-67 and col.16 lines 1-4), and a second database (first data) which is indexable by individual clients (col. 16, lines 5-8). It further teaches that these two databases can be combined to a single database indexable by client or resource identity (network addresses). (col.16, lines 7-9). The reference fails to teach to generate a user profile by associating the user with a first profile and in the orders of the columns (creating a table that includes a first column for user identifiers including the first identifier, a second column for the corresponding category information and a third column for the at least some of the temporal information) as claimed, comparing the data for the user within the database (table) to existing profiles, and matching the network addresses that are common to the first and second data. Therefore, it would

Art Unit: 2154

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to manipulate the information in the databases (existing profiles) by comparing the data within the table (database), associating the user with a profile and matching (the network addresses) to generate a user profile table (database) that includes a first column for user identifiers including the first identifier, a second column for the corresponding category information and a third column for the at least some of the temporal information such that the database can be queried to permit the server to assemble a web page or target an ad banner based upon the diverse interests of the users as taught by Davis.

Referring to claim 8,

The reference Davis fails to teach selling the user profile. However, it teaches that user profile is a valuable tool for advertisers and marketers to determine the effectiveness and value of network-based advertisement and marketing resources. (col. 4, lines 19-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to sell the user profile and generate the income.

Referring to claim 9,

The reference teaches that the tracking program (the program for creating a database (tables) for user profiles, can use multiple databases to store and process the information (col.17, lines 59-62). It also teaches that the database can reside on a separate machine (third-party source). (col.17, line66-67 and col.18, line 1-8). Although the reference teaches, in case of creating multiple databases for the user profile, that a database (second data) can include information such as URL of the web document (col.

Art Unit: 2154

15, lines 60-66), the reference fails to teach the corresponding category information

including meta tags for the network addresses. Therefore, it would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to add meta tags

for the network addresses such that the web sites in accordance with the user profile

can be linked and presented to the user.

Referring to claims 10, 11, and 12,

Claims 10, 11 and 12 are claims to a data processing system readable medium having

code embodied therein, the code including instructions executable by a data processing

system to cause the data processing system to perform methods of claims 1, 2 and 3.

Therefore, claims 10, 11, and 12 are rejected for the reasons set forth in above

paragraph for claims 1, 2 and 3.

Referring to claim 17,

Claim 17 is claim to a data processing system readable medium having code embodied

to perform methods of claim 8. Therefore, claim 17 is rejected for the reasons set forth

in above paragraph for claim 8.

Referring to claim 18,

Claim 18 is claim to a data processing system readable medium having code embodied

to perform methods of claim 9. Therefore, claim 18 is rejected for the reasons set forth

in above paragraph for claim 9.

5. Claims 4-7 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Davis et al. (hereinafter Davis)(US 5,796, 952) in view of Thomas (US 6,128,663).

Page 5

Art Unit: 2154

Referring to claims 4, 5,6 and 7,

The reference Davis teaches the user profile permitting the server (network access provider) to assemble a web page or target an ad banner based upon the diverse interests of user (selecting a first marketing information regarding an item where in selecting is based at least in part on the user profile; and sending the first marketing information to the user, selecting is performed by a network access provider; and the first marketing information includes a banner advertisement that is to be displayed near a periphery of a view) (col.13, lines 57-67). The reference Davis also teaches that the ad banner can include multiple links to other diverse web sites and means by to order or purchase goods and services. (col. 13, lines 63-67 and col.14, lines 1-46) (at least one of the network addresses corresponds to a network site is owned or controlled by a company that sells the item; and the first marketing information comprises an offer to sell the item.)The reference Davis fails to teach applying the filter before sending the first marketing information. The reference Thomas teaches to apply filter by selecting one of a plurality of available image files (second marketing information and more) for the identified advertisement banner. (col.2, lines 51-63) (selecting comprises selecting the first marketing information and second marketing information; and the method further comprises applying a filter, wherein: the second marketing information is filtered out and the first marketing information passes; and applying the filter is performed before sending.) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Davis with Thomas. Because the

Page 7

user profile is a valuable tool for advertisers and marketers to determine the

effectiveness and value of network-based advertisement and marketing resources as

taught by Davis.

Referring to claims 13, 14, 15, and 16,

Claims 13, 14, 15 and 16 are claims to a data processing system readable medium

having code embodied to perform methods of claims 4, 5, 6, and 7. Therefore, claims

13, 14, 15 and 16 are rejected for the reasons set forth in above paragraph for claims 4,

5, 6, and 7.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ashok B. Patel whose telephone number is (703) 305-

2655. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)

872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-

3900.

Abp:

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100